

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Applicant:

Paul S. Collins

§ Art Unit: 2833

§

§

§

§

§

Serial No.: 10/039,015

Examiner: Alexander Gilman

Filed: January 2, 2002

Atty Docket: ITL.0691US  
P13222For: Coil Spring Extension  
Mechanism for a PC Card

Box AF  
Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, DC 20231

REPLY TO FINAL REJECTION

Sir:

In response to the final office action mailed November 14, 2002, reconsideration is requested in view of the following remarks.

REMARKS

The office action contends that Johnson does disclose a catch. The Examiner alternately contends either that a spring biased catch as claimed is inherently present or, in fact, it is actually present.

The assertion that "Johnson should be inherently spring biased," "to prevent any jam in a case of a small inclination of the traveler (24) from a linear movement" is based on hindsight, not inherency. Here, taking the benefits of the claimed invention, the Examiner simply asserts that the prior art must have done the claimed invention because it is good. But, of course, the prior art did not do it because it no where mentions the possibility of using a spring biased catch. The prior art simply did not realize the benefits and the Examiner cannot contend that it inherently does so when there is no mention of the possibility.

Date of Deposit: November 21, 2002  
I hereby certify under 37 CFR 1.8(a) that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage on the date indicated above and is addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, Washington DC 20231.

*Cynthia L. Hayden*  
Cynthia L. Hayden